Exhibit G

WILMERHALE

Amy Kreiger Wigmore

+1 202 663 6096 (t)
+1 202 663 6363 (f)
amy.wigmore@wilmerhale.com

July 17, 2006

Via Facsimile and First-Class Mail
Charanjit Brahma
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Re: *Smith Kline & French Laboratories, LTD and SmithKline Beecham Corp., d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 05-197 (D. Del.)

Dear Charanjit:

I am writing to confirm the status of Teva's enablement challenge to Claim 3 of the '860 patent. In its Second Supplemental Responses to GSK's First Set of Interrogatories, Teva asserts that "Claims 1-3 of the '860 patent are also invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for failure to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine without undue experimentation what an 'effective non-toxic amount' of a claimed compound that is effective to treat conditions of Parkinson's Disease in a human being." (Second Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 4, paragraph (2).)[1/] Although Teva bears the burden of proof on this issue, it did not serve any expert reports addressing this topic on or before the July 10 deadline for opening expert reports. Moreover, in the expert report submitted by John Paul Long, Teva appears to concede that claim 3 of the '860 patent was enabled. *See* Long Report at 14 ("In light of the information I have identified above, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that an effective, non-toxic amount of ropinirole could be administered to treat Parkinson's disease . . . .")

In light of this admission and Teva's failure to submit an expert report, it appears that Teva is not pursuing an enablement challenge to Claim 3 of the '860 patent, in which case GSK need not put forth any expert testimony addressing this issue. Please let me know immediately if you disagree.

Sincerely,

Amy K. Wigmore

Amy K. Wigmore

1/ As you know, pursuant to the Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order entered on June 26, 2003, GSK is asserting only claim 3 of the '860 patent.